

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

March 25, 2002 LB 898, 1085

would be no need for them to use it because it can only be used above the maximum levy. That knocks...that takes a large number of schools off the list in the first place. Then, if you look at the materials that we handed out to you, and incidentally, you should know what the assumptions are in the printout, the printout assumes a 3.5 percent growth in local property values, and a 2.5 percent increase in spending; 2.5 percent, of course the base limitation. Now, under those circumstances, you would find that there would be 70 school systems that would be impinged by LB 898, that is, unable to compensate for the reduction in state aid in LB 898. If you do the exclusion, there are still 56 school districts that would be impinged by general policies, not by LB 898. What happens in the analysis is that it shows that 56 school systems would be impinged by the general state aid policies. And, of course, those state aid policies include, not only LB 806, but the levy limitations of LB 1114. And those 56 school systems, I will reiterate, will continue to be impinged by the existing policies. You can look through and you'll find schools that are familiar to you because they've either attempted to have levy overrides, have not had levy overrides, or you would have seen their fiscal problems discussed in the newspaper. The exclusion does not, does not resolve the difficulties that the general policies are creating for those school districts. The other thing that I should note about the exclusion is that it is accessible only by a supermajority vote of the board, and that may reduce its use. We're not intending to suggest that we believe that there should be a generalized increase in property taxes to compensate for the reduction in state aid in LB 898. On the other hand, we think that it is reasonable to afford school districts that have the necessity, the opportunity to make up for the...the loss in state aid from the amount that they would have been certified on February 1st. And again, I will note that there are a large number of school systems in the state that can do that without the exclusion. So the exclusion is only for the benefit of...of, you might note, 70 school systems out of 263. So I think it is only fair to provide the exclusion, and at least allow some of those school districts...and again, we're noting that maybe as many as 56 school systems would not be benefited even by the exclusion, they're still going to have financial troubles related to general school finance and levy issues. We